

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 32 Case file # 70-74575.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Result of trial or guilty plea is not known, no transcript.

CRM-22322

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 9:45 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

File #: 70-74575

Laboratory #(s): 50923053

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>□</u>	_____	<u>□</u>	<u>□</u>
<u>WZ</u>	<u>□</u>	<u>X</u>	_____	<u>□</u>	<u>□</u>
_____	<u>□</u>	<u>□</u>	_____	<u>□</u>	<u>□</u>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: Not available

Testimony Date(s): _____ Pages: _____

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 50923053 Date: Mar 4, 1986
Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____
Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: _____

Page 1 of 3

CRM-22323

Initials: SR

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 9/17/85

Results of Review

File #: 70-74575

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q12, Q21-25, K1-K3, K6-K7

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

XX ☐ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 70-74575

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated, are in pencil and not ink and abbreviations are used that are difficult to interpret. The technician's notes do not document the recovery of hair from the Q items. Pubic hairs from the Q7 bed sheet were recovered that are different from the victim's and the suspect's pubic hair, but these were not reported. Head hairs from Q9 bed spread and Q12 pillowcase were recovered that are different from the victim's and the suspect's pubic hair, but these were not reported.

Review completed at: 10:30 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.75 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberson
(Signature)

11/05/2001
(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SR